

### **REMARKS**

After entry of the above amendments, claims 1, 3-19, 21-24, and 91-92 will be pending in the present application. Claims 2, 20, and 25-90 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 3-4, 12-13, 15, 19, 21, and 23 have been amended to explicitly recite what was implicit, to further clarify the invention, to incorporate elements from cancelled claims, and/or to correct informalities. New claims 91-92 have been added. Support for the claim amendments and the new claims can be found in the specification, drawings, and claims as originally filed. No new matter has been added.

The present claim amendments and claim cancellations are solely for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the present application. Thus, Applicant is not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by the claims as previously presented is not patentable over art cited by the Examiner. Applicant reserves the right to pursue claims directed to the subject matter encompassed by the claims as previously presented and any additional claims in one or more continuing and/or divisional applications.

### **Claim Rejections**

Claims 1, 3-5, 10-12, 14-17, and 22-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0046248 to Drexler (hereinafter “Drexler”), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,122,633 to Leymann et al. (hereinafter “Leymann”). Claims 6-9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drexler, in view of Leymann, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,870,761 to Demers et al. (hereinafter “Demers”). Claim 13 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drexler, in view of Leymann, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,704,742 to Huth et al. (hereinafter “Huth”). Claims 18-19 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drexler, in view of Leymann, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,658,426 to Poskanzer (hereinafter “Poskanzer”).

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

1. A method for converting messaging data into relation table format in a database system, the messaging data being within a messaging system, the method comprising the steps of:
  - (a) providing a plurality of table formatting specifications;
  - (b) utilizing the plurality of table formatting specifications to automatically build and store a table function in the database system; and
  - (c) invoking the table function from within the database system through a single database language statement, the table function
    - (c1) invoking at least one messaging function within the database system to access the messaging data,
    - (c2) converting the messaging data into relational table format according to the plurality of table formatting specifications, and
    - (c3) populating a relational table within the database system with the converted messaging data.

It is unclear to Applicant which element in Drexler the Examiner is construing as teaching or suggesting the “table function” recited in claim 1. Specifically, Drexler discloses a “utility program 40” that receives email messages, decides whether the email messages should be saved to “database 80”, and parses the email messages that are to be saved to “database 80” (*see, e.g.*, FIG. 2 and para [0029] of Drexler). The “utility program 40” in Drexler, however, cannot be construed as teaching or suggesting the “table function” recited in claim 1 because the “table function” is invoked through a “single database language statement”. Nowhere does Drexler teach or suggest that “utility program 40” is invoked in such a fashion.

Additionally, claim 1 recites that the “table function” invokes “at least one messaging function within the database system to access the messaging data”. Drexler does not teach or suggest that the “utility program 40” needs to invoke any function in order to access the email messages.

Further, Drexler specifically states that “utility program 40 uses the association 60 to associate and save certain data from the email messages 10 to appropriate records, tables or fields in the database 80” (para. 0028 of Drexler). In contrast, claim 1 recites that the “table function . . . convert[s]

the messaging data into relational table format according to the plurality of table formatting specifications, and populat[es] a relational table within the database system with the converted messaging data”.

Therefore, “utility program 40” in Drexler cannot be construed as teaching or suggesting the “table function” recited in claim 1.

Although “association 60” in Drexler is used to associate and save data from email messages to a database, “association 60” also cannot be construed as teaching or suggesting the “table function” recited in claim 1. In particular, similar to the “utility program 40”, Drexler does not teach or suggest that the “association 60” is invoked through a “single database language statement”.

In addition, as discussed above, it is the “utility program 40” that accesses the email messages, not the “association 60”. Further, Drexler does not teach or suggest that the “association 60” invokes any function at all. Rather, Drexler appears to teach the exact opposite, i.e., that the “association 60” is used by other programs.

Therefore, “association 60” in Drexler also cannot be construed as teaching or suggesting the “table function” recited in claim 1.

Leymann, Demers, Huth, and Poskanzer do not cure the deficiencies of Drexler discussed above. Consequently, even if Drexler were combined with Leymann, Demers, Huth, and Poskanzer, the combination would neither teach nor suggest the “table function” recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, based at least on the reasons above, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, and the claims that depend therefrom, are patentable over Drexler, in view of Leymann, Demers, Huth, and Poskanzer.

**CONCLUSION**

On the basis of the above remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is believed to be warranted and such action is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,  
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

Dated: March 4, 2008

/Erin C. Ming/  
Erin C. Ming  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 47,797  
(650) 475-1449